



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/559,795

12/08/2005

Masakatsu Nitawaki

107348-00543

7495

4372 7590 11/19/2008  
ARENT FOX LLP  
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 400  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

LUGO, CARLOS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3673

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/19/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com  
IPMatters@arentfox.com  
Patent\_Mail@arentfox.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/559,795	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NITAWAKI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CARLOS LUGO	<b>Art Unit</b> 3673	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Carlos Lugo. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Murat Ozgu. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 November 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
           c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☐ No.  
       If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☐ was not reached.    h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In a telephone interview with Mr. Ozgu, the applicant explains the position of the application, that the assignee and the inventive entity are different, therefore, the double patenting rejection should be withdrawn. The examiner would take the point into consideration and may provide a different action in the future, if is required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Carlos Lugo/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3673	
--	--